

HOW NOT TO HANDLE A SEX DISCRIMINATION CASE IS DEMONSTRATED BY MITSUBISHI AUTO COMPANY

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am positively amazed by the executives at Mitsubishi Auto Co. They seem to be destined to go in the textbook as the classic textbook case on how not to handle a sex discrimination case. Over the weekend, they decided that they would now try and get out from under the EEOC charges that have been filed against them. This case has been one that has been documented in newspapers all over the place, and they constantly continue to spend all of their money trying to do legal maneuvers, find fancy high-priced people that they can hide behind to say that they are coming clean.

I guess the bottom line is "denial is not a river in Egypt." It seems to be something that is flowing right through the executive offices of Mitsubishi Auto Co., and it is a shame they do not just settle this case and get on with it. I think everybody would have a whole lot more respect for all of them.

THE FAMILY LEAVE ACT LAID A FOUNDATION FOR THE FAMILY INVOLVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me, and I first of all take the floor and say how very, very sad I am by the passing of our colleague, BILL EMERSON. This is a man who cared very much about hunger issues and nutrition issues, and he will be sadly missed because those are not great power issues. You can imagine, hungry people do not have political action committees and they are not really involved in the great power process. So they have lost a friend, and we have lost a friend, and my deepest sympathy goes to their family.

Now, I wanted to talk a bit today about what is going on in Tennessee, which I think is very exciting. Vice President GORE and his wife Tipper, and the President and Mrs. Clinton, are all in Tennessee doing a family reunion. They are doing a family reunion where they are calling families together and continuing the dialog of what can Government do to make family life a little less stressful. A lot of people say we do not have the values anymore for families. We have those values. We have those values. The problem is the whole society is pressing down on families so hard that it is very hard for a family to sustain itself. So

the question is, Is there anything that can be done for a little relief?

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I am doing with the gentleman from Connecticut, Senator DODD, and that they will be talking about today in Tennessee is to extend the family medical leave concept that we passed 2 years ago. The family medical leave that we passed 2 years ago gave families for the first time the right in the workplace to have unpaid leave upon the birth or adoption of a child or a critical chronic illness of a member of the family. Because the President and Vice President listened so well and many others have been listening so well to what families have said, they have said this family leave has really been a salvation for them in many cases.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are introducing a bill to lower the covered companies down to 25. If you have 25 or more employees, we think you should be covered by family leave. Right now, it is up at 50. We think that experiment worked so well, and we had a whole year of hearings all around America so that we are now ready to make the next step and lower it. That will be a very, very exciting thing and we hope that we can get that passed.

Now, the next part, now we are talking about parental involvement leave, because what so many parents tell us is that they want to be more involved in the child's education, but where they work they cannot take the time off. So this would give each parent a couple of days of unpaid leave a year where they could participate in the child's educational advancement. You know, all sorts of corporations give schools machinery, equipment, computers, and that is all wonderful. But they will tell you they are so understaffed that unless they have people who know how to use them and can help them, they do not do much good.

So we are saying let us work together with corporate America to find a way where we also allow employees who are in the work force to be able to take a couple unpaid days of leave and invest it in their child's education. We have study after study showing that any child does much better in school if the parents are interested, if the parents are involved, and if the parents are tracking along. We desperately need to allow people that option. One of the things that has troubled me, imagine, project yourself 100 years into the future and suppose we are going through some of the surveys we now see in this country. We see survey after survey showing that the average American will tell you if they get up in the morning and their child care has fallen apart or their spouse is chronically ill that they feel much safer calling their employer and lying about that. They feel much safer if they call their employer and tell them that the car broke down, rather than the truth. Now, 100 years from now, they are going to dig us up and say, "What did they do, wor-

ship these cars? I mean, they care more about their cars than children, spouses, family members." I do not think so.

But the same thing also goes with what we see these surveys talking about what a person says if they want to go to the child's school to participate. How many will tell their employer that? Very few. Most people will say they feel much more comfortable saying they are going to play golf. Now, going to play golf is more important than going to participate in your child's school? I do not think most Americans think it is more important, but they think that their employer will not be as apt to dock them if they say they are going to play golf or they are going to play tennis or they are going hunting, rather than they are going to the school.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of craziness has happened that the values that we all feel in our home, in our kitchen, around the kitchen table, the things that pull us into our family and pull us into the institutions they want us to participate in, that somehow we do not feel that we are able to talk about those out in the work world without being condemned, without being punished or without having our career on the line? Something is really wrong.

So family leave began to work on that and now we are going to have a parental involvement act that really is just like family leave. It is not paid, so you are taking a penalty to do it. Very few people can have very many unpaid days. But at least a couple times a year you could do this if you wanted to do this and not worry about having to use sick days and not having to make something up or whatever.

□ 1415

I think we need to continue this dialog with America's families to find everything we can find to see what other kinds of things like this we could do just to give them a few tools to lift some of the pressure they are feeling up off their shoulders.

When I talk to the average American family they tell me they feel like one of those hamsters in a wheel. My kids used to have hamsters when they were growing up, and in the cage there was a little wheel and the hamsters would run and run and run and run, and they never got out of the wheel, obviously. I think families feel that way. They run faster every year, they are more exhausted every year, and they are still at the bottom of the wheel. I think it is because families still have the same values their families had but they feel they are in a society where they will be penalized for expressing those values or trying to act on those values.

Well, if that is true, we are in real bad shape and the No. 1 goal of this Government should be to try and make sure that you will not be penalized for expressing and acting on those values. Anyone who thinks a car is more important than a child, I want to talk to them.

Now, the other thing that just came out, too, was the fact of child support enforcement. We are hearing all this stuff about welfare reform, welfare reform, welfare reform. Very important. But when we still only see about 18 percent of child support enforcement, as that report showed last week, we are still not making much of a commitment. For the parents that are supporting their children, obviously, they get very angry with the other parents who cast their children off like they are a used up can of pop and refuse to pay. Obviously, they do not want to have to pay for their kids and someone else's kids that they walked away from.

On the other hand, we have to be very concerned about those young people because they are our country's future. Are we afraid to talk about the common good anymore? And the common good is certainly that all young people get all the education their ability and desire drives them to want, because they are certainly going to be better citizens and then our country is going to be a better place.

So I think making parents more responsible, and I think the parents that have taken responsibility ought to be very angry with the parents who will not take responsibility. Now, we cannot force them to live together but we can certainly force them to pay and make that family as economically whole as possible. It is startling to me that we force children to have that welfare stamp stamped on them because some adults do not want to take economic responsibility for children that they participated in bringing into this world.

One of the prime values that we should talk about here is the fact that we have not done a good job doing that because they do not want to make adults mad. The kids do not vote but the adults do vote, and they are afraid they will make the adults mad if they make those adults become responsible parents and pay their child support.

So I would hope that families would also be talking about that today at the family reunion, because I think an awful lot of us, again, are very concerned about what that survey will look like 100 years from now when somebody recognizes that 97 percent of the payments get made and only 18 percent of child support payments were made.

Again, do we care more about cars than our children? If we do, we really are lost souls, and if we really do, then we may as well forget it for the 21st century because those children are the primary stockholders in this next century, and if they are not ready and if they are not prepared and if we are not getting them ready and prepared, then we have really given up on the future.

So those are all the things going on down in Tennessee, and there is another little piece that I would like to talk about, the other little piece about what happens with Medicare, what hap-

pens with Medicaid, the raging debate that has been going on in this body about Medicare and Medicaid. What does it mean; where are we going; how come it is so partisan; can we not get some kind of consensus?

I have thought and thought and thought about what could I say, what could I say that would try to bring it down and then all of a sudden, voila, I came across Little Red Riding Hood. Little Red Riding Hood, I think, tells us more about what is going on in the Medicare-Medicaid debate than anything I can think of.

Let me go back and start so I can try to make some sense out of this. We all know that we have to make adjustments to Medicare and we have to make adjustments in Medicaid because no one ever guesses exactly what kind of premiums should be paid, how many people are going to be sick. Our best guess is sometimes off, so we tinker here and we tinker there. That has been going on since they created the system, that is what should go on, and that is what should continue to go on. But some people use those reports to say, OK, this is it, it is going off the cliff, kill it. Well, I do not think we should kill it. Other people say, oh, we did not mean kill it, we are just trying to fix it, trust us.

That is where Little Red Riding Hood comes in, because if you remember Little Red Riding Hood, the great pictures are of grandma dressing up like the wolf, or the wolf dressing up like grandma. I got that wrong, did I not? We have the wolf, who sneaks into grandma's bed clothes, climbs in the bed, and then what happens when Little Red Riding Hood comes in? Well, it is not too surprising; the wolf jumps out and she sees who it really is.

My question about Medicare and Medicaid is when the Republicans have voted against Medicare when it was started, said they did not like it, said they would like to have it wither on the vine, and I could give you hundreds of quotes, do you then trust them to fix it? Is that not the equivalent of the wolf putting on grandma's clothes and getting in bed? That is certainly how I see it. If for years they have railed against it, not thought it was a good idea, and now they say, trust us, we want to fix it, that is no different than the wolf putting on the little hat, crawling under the bed covers and getting ready to jump out at Little Red Riding Hood.

So we must make sure we do not become Little Red Riding Hood. This all sounds so esoteric, and I hope none of you ever have to go through what I have gone through to really feel it, but a couple of weeks ago my mother fell and broke her hip. Now, my mother has never used Medicare. She has been under Medicare, she is in her eighties, but she has never had to use it, she has been very healthy, nor has my father, but all of a sudden she broke her hip. When a woman in her eighties breaks her hip, we are talking about expensive

procedures. We are talking about long-term rehabilitation. Never have I been so happy there has been something such as Medicare, because I think my very proud mother would be absolutely devastated if she had to go through the breaking of the hip and then also the asking of her children for money to help her recover. This is devastating enough to her to have to be on her back for a while, but this is going to cost a lot of money. I think since she has been paying in for tens of years or decades, probably she will just be gradually getting it all back, but, nevertheless, in prior times, before we had Medicare, the family would have been in crisis trying to figure out where to get the money so she could get the proper care, and that is just to something that we want to enter the equation at such a traumatic time.

Now, there is no question my brother and I would do everything we can to try and protect our parents, who have been so wonderful to us, but we are not rich, and the way medical bills run, I will tell you, luckily my mother is not in that bad a shape, but all of a sudden I can visualize how somebody could have something happen where very rapidly my brother and I could have been out of all of our resources within 6 months to a year. That is not at all impossible under the system and the costs of our wonderful medical care that we have.

So people need to think about that. And as we talk about Medicare and Medicaid, let me constantly stipulate, of course we have to constantly work to fix it, but we also have to make sure that it is still there, that fixing it does not mean killing it. That, I think, is very critical.

When we look at the other health care issues that we are talking about, this bill that we are hoping to get through that Senator KASSEBAUM had introduced, which is very important, it says that you and I, this is not Medicare, this is not Medicaid, you and I can transport our insurance with us; we can be guaranteed that we can get it no matter what our physical state is, and so forth. That is very important. But one of the things that they are trying to do to ruin that, the reason we have not been able to take it up, is another variable.

Imagine a pool of water. That is how we want health care to be, a pool that we are all in, just like my mother and father were in a Medicare pool for years and years and years and never drew a dime. It is a pool where everybody is paying in and, hopefully, no one gets sick. But if they do, you are sharing the cost in the pool and that is how you hope to keep the premiums down.

Well, what the Republicans want to do is lower a ladder into that pool so the healthiest people and the wealthiest people can climb out. Normally in a swimming pool if you are climbing out, the water goes down. But let me tell you in an insurance pool, if you let the

healthiest people climb out of that pool and get a special deal and you let the wealthiest people climb out of that pool and get a special deal, then the water; that is, the insurance premiums, they are not going to go down, they are going to go up.

So if we allow the MSA's to go through, which is the equivalent of the ladder letting the healthy-wealthy people escape from the pool, we will have some guarantees that do not mean anything. If you have a guarantee that they have to sell you an insurance policy, that sounds wonderful until you find out that they can also charge you \$3,000 a month and you do not have the money. You have a guarantee that does not mean anything.

I have a guarantee I can buy a Rolls Royce. The only problem is I do not have the money so it does not do me any good. So we do not want the pool to be decimated of the healthiest and wealthiest or we will end up with something that does not work. So think all of the health care issues have to be kept in that context or we get very lost.

There is another issue that a lot of us would like to talk about, too, and that is what will happen in this campaign year. I guess it is no secret, most people know that I will be leaving after 24 years at the end of this year, and I am very saddened about what I have seen happening in campaigns. I think they have gotten so much worse than when I first ran.

When I first ran they were so much more issue based. They were fun. They were not the big sleazy fights that we see. And the money, the money is unbelievable. When I first ran, my average campaign contribution was \$7.50. Hello. Do you think anybody running for Congress has an average campaign contribution anywhere close to that? Of course, after my 24 years I am now up to about 50 bucks, PAC's and all, so I have not evolved very far. But let me say the big money that is swirling around out there, I think, tends to taint the whole thing. Anybody who believes someone gives you thousands of dollars because they believe in good government, it really does not pass the straight face test. I think they want access, and I think they probably want something more than good government, probably something that affects them very directly.

So when I see the big bucks going into it, that have really skewed it, when I see it has moved from an issue base to a very personal type of base when you try to destroy people one-on-one, and when I now see more and more people trying to do independent expenditures and the candidate says these independent expenditures are whirling around out there running TV ads and they can savage anybody, the candidate can always say, well, gee, I do not know, they are just spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in my name, but I have no control over them. Gosh, I am so sorry they are so savage and awful, but I have no control at all.

Now, are we in this democracy just going to surrender to that or are we going to do something about that? Is there anything we can do about it? I am so tired of Americans throwing up their hands and saying nothing we can do. It just gets worse and worse every year, and so more and more Americans say, well, I am not even going to vote.

□ 1430

First of all, this House hopefully is going to have reform week, and I do not think we can call it a reform week unless we do something about the big bucks in campaigns, about the soft money, about independent expenditures. If we do not deal with that, we may as well forget it. That is because I feel so strongly that money is tainting this process and makes it look more and more like it is nothing but a coin operated legislative machine. If you do not have the coins to put in, you do not get the legislation out. Period.

So the average American feels very sold out. I feel so strongly about that one day we went to the top of this dome and had a sold sign that we walked around with, because even I feel like we are getting sold out on our priorities and what we should be doing. Hopefully that reform week that is coming up will deal with that issue. That is the key issue, that is the core issue, and that absolutely must be dealt with.

There is something else that every American can do. I was in Minnesota this weekend and ran into a person campaigning for their statehouse who put out a very simple, fair campaign code. If people all over America did this, we could really change our democratic process to be something we are proud of again. Is it not kind of embarrassing, the whole world is now saying, we like your possess, we want to be a democratic process. We are saying that is fine, but do not come see ours because it kind of stinks. We do not like it anyone. It does not pass the smell test.

So this wonderful young woman out in Minnesota had come up with just simple four little points. Her first point was, I will take full responsibility for all brochures, advertisements, and press releases done by my campaign. That is fairly simple, is it not? The candidate takes responsibility for anything their campaign does. So they cannot stand there and say: My press secretary did it; my campaign manager did it; my counselor did it. No, no, no, no. You take responsibility. And if you take responsibility, this means that, if something goes out from your campaign, you bloody well better have seen it and, if you did not see it, you still take responsibility.

It is the captain of the ship principle, simple, easy, and very important. She also says that the second point should be people talking about they should tell the truth. They should not distort or misrepresent votes taken by either

side. I think that is terribly critical and very simple, again, to enforce.

She also thinks that it is very important that each candidate do the following: No. 3, ask groups that support you to follow the same rules and take responsibility for what they say. For example, if I were a candidate and someone came to me and said, we really like you, PAT SCHROEDER, we are going to go out and spend \$200,000 in advertising in your name, I would say to them, you can do that, that is wonderful, but you only do it on these rules. I must sign off on what you say. There will be no misrepresenting of votes. It must be truthful. And I am going to take responsibility for what you do. If you do something that is out of line, I am pulling the plug.

How simple is that? Imagine what could happen. This woman is amazing. She is handing it out all over Minnesota and asking people to sign it. I just picked it up. I thought, what a great idea. It is Yankee ingenuity at work. Everybody sits around bemoaning the fact that campaigns get worse and worse, and here is someone who has done something about it. Yankee ingenuity is back.

So I hope every American starts redefining Yankee ingenuity campaign by campaign by campaign across this great country. Because heaven only knows, I know very few people who will stand up anywhere and say, we are so proud of our democratic process and the level of civic debate going on among the candidates. Let me tell you, it is so helpful, you go to see civic debates, you go to these community debates and you come out and really understand the issues. They are great forums.

Do you know anybody like that? If you do, I want to know where they are. I travel around this country a lot, and I found people saddened, their heart is broken by what has happened, by the civil discourse, by the constant lowering down and dumbing down of the whole political process.

I think we have a change to take it back. It is only going to happen if we do it campaign by campaign individual by individual. The act of omission is as bad as the act of not doing it. So you really have to get out and do something. You cannot just sit back on the bench and be a backbencher.

I just wanted to share that, too. If there is anyone frustrated, and I know there are a lot because I hear from them all the time, this is a great chance to move out, start putting down those principles, saying to candidates, please, you should sign these agreements. You could even have some political science groups or whatever oversee them, police them or whatever. But if we do not reclaim this process, we are in trouble. I think everybody knows that.

Now, one of the other things that I wanted to talk a bit about today, too, is what has been happening with women. I was very excited to see what

is happening in the Olympics. We are seeing young woman from America move out in astronomical numbers. They are really looking like they are going to do very well for this great country, that there are going to be a lot more medals not just by our young men, who have always been there, but the women are claiming more and more and more every single year. So we are very proud of them.

I am particularly in awe because, being 55 years old, when I grew up, there was no such thing as title 9, which comes from this great Federal Government. There was no such thing as title IX. So we had no gym, really. We had a few gym classes, yes, but I mean they were nothing. The biggest thing was you were afraid that they would have a fire drill in the middle of your gym class and somebody would see you in your stupid gym suit and you would die of embarrassment. As a consequence, I really have no sports at all.

When we played basketball, they thought women were so frail that we could only dribble twice and we could not cross the center line. You can imagine what exciting games those were. If you can only dribble twice and could not cross the center line, it was like boring. But that is where we were. It was always interesting they never thought women were too frail to scrub floors, but they thought we were too frail for sports. You could scrub floors somehow but, if we stood up and engaged in sports, I guess they thought we would faint.

So title IX said that all the educational institutions that receive any kind of public money had to provide the same sports and educational opportunity for women that they did for men. As a consequence, many of our young women in the schools participated in sports and found they had all sorts of talent. This country has gone on to develop that talent. We are going to see them showing those talents that we will all be cheering on in the Olympics.

So why am I saying this? What is the big deal?

Well, the big deal is we have an affirmative action bill in front of this Congress that can undo title IX, that could roll it all back, that could put the women back out of the gyms and the sports programs and push them back out of a lot of the educational programs they have been able to involve themselves in. That I think we want to think about a very long time. There are any number of other things that that affirmative action bill would do. It just kind of guts everything that was done from the 1960's on.

It is done in the name of things that we all want to agree with. It says, well, you know, we really should be a color-blind society. And they are right, we really should be a color-blind society. But let me ask you, Americans, when we have got this terrible rash of church burnings going on and black churches,

how can we say we are there yet? How can we say we are a color-blind society? I do not think we can, when this awful act is going on that we are all trying to end.

I could give example after example after example. So people say what we want ourselves to be but we have all sorts of empirical evidence that we are not there yet. What these programs were about was to try and open doors for people and help get them over some of the barriers that have been artificially put up in front of different groups because of their gender, their religion, their race, their ethnic background, whatever it was.

If America is going to really allow everybody to develop to their full potential, then you cannot allow artificial barriers to be put up in front of people all over the place so that you prevent them from being able to develop. That is just about how simple it is.

So I am hoping very much that we do not see this bill come to the floor, but we are very apt to see it come to the floor and in the heat and passion of the moment, with all the current flowing the other way, I am afraid we will have all sorts of folks run to pass this bill. And once it gets implemented about 5 years from now we will suddenly realize we overreacted.

The problem with politics right now is to stand up and talk about reforming something is not an applause line. If you stand up and say, we are going to blow it up, hey, there is an applause line. You find that over and over and over again. We are tired of affirmative action, we do not like it, blow it up. Well, everybody would say, hey, the world has changed since it went into effect.

There should be some changes and modifications, let us talk about those. And let us bring it into the 1990's. But let us not blow it up because we are not there yet. We have moved from point zero to maybe 50 percent, maybe 60 percent. We could have a debate about where it is, so let us fine tune it and figure out where we go; but let us not blow it up, and see if we cannot go back to where we were when we began the whole process.

I think almost every single thing you think of that we have been dealing with in this last year and a half fits under that same category. You may think people have gone too far with environmental regulations. But if you say, then let us talk about that and let us figure out where they went too far and let us figure out what we do about that instead, nobody wants to hear that. They want to hear just blow it up. Let us do away with them. We do not want them. I think that goes way too far.

So I guess my plea is for how do we lower the level of the discourse and how do we roll up our shirt sleeves and get on with the hard work of trying to reform things, to fix things, and to put them back together again rather than

to just continue this inflammatory rhetoric about how I hate government more than you hate government. No, you do not, I am going to go out there and blow it up even harder than you are going to blow it up.

When you get all done, what are you going to replace it with? I used to chair the Civil Service Subcommittee, and I would constantly find myself in that position where you knew what the applause line was but you knew it was wrong. You knew you could get great applause from audiences if you went out and said the Federal Government is fat, and it is lazy, and it is terrible, and blow it up. And everybody said yes, yes, yes, that is wonderful.

And then you would say to people, OK, now what do you want to blow up? Do you want to blow up the Park Service? No. We like the parks. What about the immigration service? No, we need the immigration service. What about drug enforcement? We need them. What about the FBI? No, we need them.

You go through the whole thing. The only thing they really wanted to blow up was the IRS. They hated the IRS. They did not want the IRS, but they wanted all those things that came out of it.

So I guess what all of us have to do as citizens, as we start talking, and I hope we do in this political year, start talking about what is our responsibility as citizens, is we have to stop wringing our hands and shouting loudly, instead of rolling our shirt sleeves, lower our voices and start figuring out how we come together around a table to fix things. That is what you do in a family.

There is nothing in my house that is ever perfect. My house is constant maintenance. My cars are constant maintenance. I am middle-aged. I am constant maintenance. I do not blow myself up or burn my house down or decide I am not going to drive my car because the wheel bearings fell out last week or whatever happened this week. No, we keep fixing it and moving on. Government is that way, too. So how that factors in, how we bring campaigns around, how we continue on with saying we cannot just promise people that this is the great American dream.

They have also got to see the reality that they can get there. It is not just a dream that can be translated into reality by having such things as affirmative action and title IX and many of the other programs that a lot of us have benefited from.

□ 1445

And how we fine-tune those, make them work better, make them fit better; all of that is terribly important. So those are all things that I think this body and this Nation needs to reflect upon.

When you see what I see, I see people becoming more and more cynical every single day, and I remind people of what the word "cynic" came from. It came

from the Greek word for yapping dog, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap. If you go back and you look at Greece, the democracy that they were so proud of in Athens that we all talked about and learned about in school, it fell because of cynics. They just all were so angry with everything. No one fixed anything, and suddenly it all fell from within.

And it is very ironic, as you look at history, to see so many civilizations could come together and work so hard to make sure nobody overcame them from the outside, but suddenly, when they started to come apart on the inside, they could not handle it. Is that not interesting?

You read over and over in history books different variations of people coming together and saying, "Well, it's not that we don't know what is wrong. We know what's wrong. We can all give speeches on what's wrong." And I bet every one of us will give a very similar speech about what is wrong: about the pressures of families, the pressures on the workplace, the pressures on what is going on with children, all of those pressures. We all can state what is wrong. The problem is we are not willing to work together to fix it. We are not willing to work together to fix it, and we want to go out and attack in full force all of the institutions that are there to fix it, and nobody has got some kind of debate about what replaces those institutions.

If you truly believe this Government can run without a government or this country can run without a government, then OK, but if it does, it will be the first. No one has—you have got to have some kind of functioning government around which you are organized; something has to be there.

So should it not be something that we are proud of? Should it not be something that we all are invested in? And should it not be something that relates to us and we relate to it?

I constantly think about the excitement of the American revolution and how did we lost it. Think about revolutions. We were not the first country that had a revolution. Almost every country in the world has had a revolution at one time or another. But so often what happens in a revolution is the guys on the outside are yelling at the people who are in power, and they say they are autocratic, they are repressive, they are all those things, and they probably are, but then the minute they take over, they become more autocratic, more repressive, more, more, more, and so it really becomes a fight over power, who has power over the people, rather than a real revolution which changes.

But the American Revolution was different because the people who beat the king did not insist on having power over. Remember, remember, there were colonists who went to George Washington after the Revolution and said to him:

"Listen, George, Forget this democracy stuff. Why do you not just be

king? We really just didn't want a king sitting on the other side of the Atlantic, but having a king here, that will be fine. Why don't you be king."

Is there a politician you would make that offer to in America today? I doubt it. But that offer was made to George, and he said, "You forgot why we fought this revolution. We fought this revolution about a democracy where everybody is going to have a chance to participate and have their voice heard." So he had an idea of what it was about, and somehow we have lost the feeling for what it is all about.

It is about civics, it is about community, it is about common good, and why we are so afraid to say those words anymore I do not know, and it is about trying to bring them around.

And so as I mention that, let me come to my final thing. I have been on the Committee on Armed Services for 24 years, and I have been very honored to sit there. The end of last week I was very troubled to realize that there were articles in the paper talking about the fact that there is a whole new tradition apparently being developed; I never heard of this before, and that is that the armed services are now putting four officers in the Speaker's office. I am not quite sure why we are putting people in uniform in congressional offices to help them with their work. Does that mean all of us are now to get four officers in our office or, because we are lower down, maybe we only get two. And what are they supposed to do? Drill the staff?

I mean I do not get this at all. If we have got all these extra people, maybe we should downsize and save some tax money.

I have written to Secretary Bill Perry asking about this and asking why these officers had been assigned to be workers in political offices. One of the great things about our military is it has not been politicized, and it has not been involved in partisan politics, and I find it very hard to put military officers in offices of congressmen and women and not have them get politicized in this body. Heaven forbid. It has been more politicized than anything I have ever seen. How you would put them in this body and have them be neutral and nonpartisan I do not know, but I just really cannot figure this out, and I wonder what it means in all of this discourse we have been having about civics and community and all of that.

The initial response we heard from the military is that they put these officers in the Speaker's office because many Members of Congress had not had experience in uniform and they thought that this would be helpful, and I mean I cannot figure that one out either. That one did not print with me. So I want a better excuse. We added up the salaries. It comes to about a quarter of a million dollars a year. That is a lot of money to be donating.

So what are they doing? Why are they doing it? How are they responsible

to citizens in America? And is this something we want our tax money doing? I certainly do not think I do, but I will wait until we hear from the Defense Department and get a much more detailed response than anything we have gotten so far. But that is troubling.

So let me finish at this point to say I hope that this Nation really finds its passion and fire for democracy.

I think democracy is a faith. All of our Forefathers said it was a faith, and it is a faith. You have to really believe it is going to work because the only way it is going to work is if people really get involved, and it is not like consumerism where you can say I do not like those burgers so I will not buy those burgers. That works for being a consumer, but in civics if you say I do not like politics so I will not get involved in politics, the difference is the people who do get involved are going to pick the leaders and the leaders are going to make the decision for you, so you just gave up your place at the table.

So democracy is a faith because we hope all citizens will stay involved, they will stay at the table, they work hard to become informed with those rights. To elect and participate comes the responsibility to know something when you do it. But how exciting. How many people gave their lives for that great, great privilege? And how many people on this planet go to bed every night wishing they had that great privilege? And we have absolutely, as a nation, got to shake off this attitude that we are in because we have a terrible attitude right now out there about democracy and a terrible attitude about our process.

You may have a better idea than democracy; I do not know. If you have got one, bring it forward. But if you do not have one, get involved and make democracy work better. Do not just sit there and holler.

I really wish that we could give people a little card every time they voted, and you could only complain if you had the current little card because I cannot tell you how many people come at me at a hundred miles per hour with their mouth going and their finger going and you know their nostrils are getting wider and they are screaming and yelling and jumping up and down and you say:

"Well, now, did you vote?"

"No."

And you really wonder, do you not, how could they give up that phenomenal privilege? They want to be heard, but they do not want to take the time to vote.

So let us think about civics, let us think about inclusiveness, let us think about common good, let us think about families, let us think about all the people gathered today at the table in Tennessee talking about what could be done to help make the pressure a little less on their family. I hope all of you think about what could make the pressure a little less on your family, and

let us all put those thoughts to work, stop shouting at each other and get on with making this great country what it should be and giving it the legacy it should have in the 21st century. We should be leading the world showing people how democracy works. We should be holding our head high.

TRIBUTE TO BILL EMERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to make some personal comments about our colleague, BILL EMERSON, who died Saturday night. BILL was a very honest, very decent, very ethical, very moral individual. As everyone knows, he had friends on both sides of the aisle. Republican and Democratic Members were very close to BILL personally.

I was in a small group with BILL that met in the House chapel every week. In the group are Republicans and Democrats, both backgrounds. We would pray for each other in the group, we would pray with each other in the group. BILL was an inspiration all the years together and was an inspiration during the very difficult time when he found out about his illness.

BILL EMERSON had a very strong faith, a very strong Christian faith. He loved the Lord very deeply, and his faith was very, very strong. As the other people know and the Washington Post points out today, BILL and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HALL worked together on the issue of hunger. The fact is BILL EMERSON went to many places with Congressman HALL, from Sudan to Ethiopia, to Somalia and similar places. I can safely say there are many people, hundreds of thousands or even millions of people that are alive today on the continent of Africa and other places that would not be alive had it not been for the work of BILL EMERSON working with Congressman HALL. BILL was totally committed to dealing with the issue of hunger and working together with TONY they did so much good that saved so many lives.

The fact is the people whose lives were saved do not even know how they were saved or why they were saved, but I want the record to show there are millions who are alive today because of the work of BILL EMERSON working with TONY HALL.

BILL loved his wife and loved his family, his four daughters, his wife Jo Ann. He would often talk about them. They were the center of his life, and he loved his family very, very much. Many times that we would meet he would talk about his wife and about his family, and we would exchange those things, and I just want that to be on the record.

□ 1500

BILL loved this institution. That should be on the record. He was a page

in this House. I believe he was a page in the House during the time that there was an assassination attempt in the House of Representatives. I remember seeing the picture of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BILL EMERSON, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. KANJORSKI, who were both pages. That is how long BILL EMERSON goes back as being identified with this body.

He loved history. I think he read every book about Winston Churchill. He probably knew more about Winston Churchill than any person I knew. He knew more about Abraham Lincoln than anyone I knew. He loved this institution. He loved the Congress and he loved the House and he loved history.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I know he loved the Lord and he loved Christ. I know in his death he has gone to be with Jesus Christ. I include for the RECORD an obituary in the Washington Post.

The material referred to is as follows:
EIGHT-TERM REP. BILL EMERSON OF MISSOURI DIES

(By Martin Weil)

Rep. Bill Emerson (R-Mo.), who was found to have inoperable lung cancer last year while serving his eighth term in Congress, died June 22 at the Bethesda Naval Medical Center. He was 58.

Despite his illness, which sometimes led him to carry a portable oxygen canister to the floor of the House, Rep. Emerson was running for reelection. Agriculture dominated his district's economy, and he was in line to become chairman of the Agriculture Committee next year if he won and his party kept control of the House.

"He was a fighter," an aide said last night. Rep. Emerson believed "that he was going to beat this thing, and he fought it all the way."

Sometimes, in response to medical advice, he used a motorized scooter to help him get around Capitol Hill, aides said, but he was proud that he did not miss a vote this year until the week before he entered the hospital.

Rep. Emerson was admitted to Bethesda last Monday with a respiratory infection, and he issued a statement Thursday saying he was "resting comfortably and following doctors' orders."

Aides said he was a lifelong smoker who gave up cigarettes after his cancer was diagnosed last fall.

"All of Congress will feel the loss of Bill Emerson," said House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.). "He was a leader on nutrition programs and a man who was admired on both sides of the aisle."

"Politics in America," a reference work on members of Congress, described Rep. Emerson as a man whose votes and speeches demonstrated "a streak of ideological conservatism" but whose legislative career bore the stamp of pragmatism.

He was named in another reference work as being one of two key Republicans on the Agriculture Committee who early last year persuaded Gingrich to drop from the Republican "Contract With America" a proposal to put food stamps into block grants to the states. The food stamp program is a major part of federal spending on agriculture.

Rep. Emerson, a member of the House Select Committee on Hunger, traveled to starvation-stricken Somalia in 1992 to spotlight conditions there. When the committee was abolished, its chairman, Rep. Tony P. Hall (D-Ohio), fasted 22 days; according to "Politics in America," Rep. Emerson fasted every Monday in sympathy.

Rep. Emerson, a native of Hillsboro, Mo., largely was raised by a grandfather who was a county judge, and he acquired early what was to be a lifelong interest in politics and government.

As a teenager eager to become a congressional page, he came to Washington in the 1950s without the promise of a job. But repeated knocking on the doors of members of his state's delegation won him admiration for his initiative and resulted soon in the post he sought.

Aides said he regarded the assignment as a dream come true. After receiving a bachelor's degree in political science from Westminster College in Fulton, Mo., he returned to Washington to work for Rep. Robert Ellsworth (R-Kan.). Subsequent jobs included stints as a lobbyist and as a staff member for Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.). In the meantime, he received a law degree from the University of Baltimore.

In 1980, he went back to Missouri to defeat a Democratic incumbent and become the first Republican to win the 8th District seat in 52 years.

Aides said Rep. Emerson's mother, Marie Hahn, his wife, Jo Ann, and his daughters, Elizabeth, Abigail, Victoria and Katharine, were at his bedside when he died.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS WITH CHINA, AND INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO PROTECT AMERICAN PATENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE BILL EMERSON

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in remembering the gentleman from Missouri, BILL EMERSON, a decent, hardworking man who made great contributions not only to this body, not only to our country, but to the cause of a humane and decent world. We will remember him. He made major contributions to this legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, today I will be discussing something that goes to the heart and soul of a moral society, a decision that we will soon make about most-favored-nation status with China. Then, after a brief discussion on most-favored-nation status with China, in which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will participate, I will give a longer presentation on a bill that will be introduced shortly on the floor of the House dealing with the American patent system and major changes that are being made in our patent system.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that as we move forward to the day when Congress will be considering most-favored-nation status for China, we must recall that this happens every year. Every year we are told that we must grant most-favored-nation status for the Communist Chinese because it will help them evolve.

The justification for not treating the Communist dictatorship like any other democratic nation, for example, like